

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/523,313		03/10/2000	Tony Gerard Rose	1263.0805	5129
5514	7590	10/31/2003		EXAMINER	
_		LLA HARPER &	· FILIPCZYK, MARCIN R		
30 ROCKE NEW YOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
11211 1011	,	V112		2171	1
				DATE MAILED: 10/31/200	3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•)	\mathcal{N}
•		Application No.		Applicant(s)	
065 8-45	09/523,313		ROSE, TONY GERARD		
Office Action S	Examiner		Art Unit		
		Marc R Filipczyk		2171	
The MAILING DATE of Period for Reply	of this communication app	ears on the cover	sheet with the c	orrespond nce ad	dress
A SHORTENED STATUTO THE MAILING DATE OF TH - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mail - If the period for reply specified above - If NO period for reply is specified above - Failure to reply within the set or exte - Any reply received by the Office later earned patent term adjustment. See Status	HIS COMMUNICATION. under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 ing date of this communication. is less than thirty (30) days, a reply ove, the maximum statutory period w inded period for reply will, by statute, than three months after the mailing	66(a). In no event, hower within the statutory mini ill apply and will expire S cause the application to	ver, may a reply be tim mum of thirty (30) days SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timel he mailing date of this co	
1) Responsive to comm	nunication(s) filed on <u>14 A</u>	<u> August 2003</u> .			
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL	. 2b)□ Thi	s action is non-fir	nal.		
closed in accordance	n is in condition for allowa e with the practice under <i>l</i>				e merits is
Disposition of Claims A) ✓ Claim(a) 1 88 in/ora	anding in the application				•
4) Claim(s) <u>1-88</u> is/are	-	•	concideration		
<u> </u>	n(s) <u>1-48 and 63-67</u> is/are	: withurawii iioiii t	consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are 6) Claim(s) <u>49-62 and 6</u>					
7) ☐ Claim(s) <u>49-02 and 0</u>					
<u> </u>	ubject to restriction and/or	r election requirer	nent		
Application Papers	abject to restriction and/or	election requirer	nent.		
9) The specification is ob	jected to by the Examiner	r .			
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed or		_	objected to by	the Examiner.	
Applicant may not requ	uest that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held	l in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11) The proposed drawing	correction filed on	is: a)□ approve	d b) disappro	ved by the Examin	er.
If approved, corrected	drawings are required in rep	ly to this Office act	ion.		
12) The oath or declaration	n is objected to by the Exa	aminer.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 11	9 and 120				
13) Acknowledgment is n	nade of a claim for foreign	priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * d) ☐ None of:				
1. Certified copies	of the priority documents	s have been recei	ved.		
2. Certified copies	of the priority documents	s have been recei	ved in Application	on No	
application	ertified copies of the prior from the International Bui ed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 1	7.2(a)).		Stage
14)☐ Acknowledgment is ma	de of a claim for domesti	c priority under 35	5 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisiona	l application).
a) ☐ The translation of 15)☐ Acknowledgment is ma	the foreign language proade of a claim for domesti				
Attachment(s)		-			
Notice of References Cited (PTC 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent I 3) Information Disclosure Statemen	Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) 🔲		(PTO-413) Paper No Patent Application (PT	

Art Unit: 2171

Response to Amendment

This action is responsive to Applicant's response filed on August 14, 2003 (paper # 12). Supplemental IDS received on August 14, 2003 has been noted. Claims 49-62 remain for examination, claims 1-48 and 63-67 remain withdrawn and newly added claims 68-88 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 49-62 and 68-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Czerwinski et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,093).

Regarding claims 49, 51, 52, 54, 84 and 86, <u>Czerwinski</u> discloses a data display apparatus/method for displaying the relationships between sets of data (content of each object), the apparatus comprising: (title)

data receiving means for receiving sets of data and similarity values for the similarity between the sets of data; (col. 1, lines 11-15 and col. 18, lines 8-16)

display control means for controlling said display means to display representations for said sets of data separated in accordance with said similarity values (abstract, lines 6-10) and to display links between the representations in accordance with the similarity values (fig. 11 O, fig. 12 C-E and col. 19, lines 49-51 and col. 21, lines 3-5, also see fig. 22).

(Note: links displayed in different colors according to similarity of objects and threshold)

Regarding claims 50 and 53, Czerwinski discloses display means to display said representations as images of said sets of data (col. 6, lines 26-32 and 38-42).

Regarding claims 55, 58, 60-62, 85 Czerwinski discloses a data display apparatus/method for displaying the relationships between sets of data (content of each object), the apparatus comprising: (title)

data receiving means for receiving sets of data and similarity values for the similarity between the sets of data; (col. 1, lines 11-15 and col. 18, lines 8-16)

arrangement calculation means for calculating an arrangement of representations for said sets of data on display means in which arrangement the representations are spaced according to said similarity values; (abstract, lines 6-10)

display control means for controlling said display means to display the arrangement of the representations; (abstract, lines 6-10, and fig. 22) and

user selection means allowing a user to select and move one of the representations (fig. 19B, blocks 1928, 1930, 1932 and 1938, and fig. 22).

Regarding claims 56, 57, 59 and 60, <u>Czerwinski</u> discloses identifying dragged objects (fig. 19B, block 1928) in relation to other objects (fig. 19B, block 1930) and, calculating and updating the location of the object in relation to other objects (fig. 19B, block 1932) using starting and target separations (col. 22, lines 5-14).

(Note: dragging an object requires control of display)

Regarding all the instances of claims 68-73 and 75-83, Czerwinski discloses receiving an input query and determining similarity values (fig. 2, item 264, and col. 18, lines 8-16).

Regarding all the instances of claim 74, Czerwinski discloses displaying thumbnail images of the sets of data as the representations (col. 6, lines 40-42).

Regarding all the instances of claims 87 and 88, Czerwinski discloses a storage medium with a cpu to carry out instruction and a signal carrying instructions (fig. 1B, 102, 104, 106 and 108).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on August 14, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The arguments and responses are listed above.

Applicant argues on page 33 of the 8/14/03 response that, "Applicants submits concurrently herewith a Substitute Specification, containing a separate heading for each body of

Art Unit: 2171

the disclosure. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the specification are requested".

In response to Applicant's argument, Examiner agrees. As such, the Examiner withdraws his objection.

Applicant argues on page 35 of the 8/14/03 response that Czerwinski does not teach separating representations for sets of data in accordance with similarity values.

In response to Applicant's argument, Examiner disagrees. Col. 18, lines 8-16, Czerwinski teaches a user interface displays data based on similarity values (keywords).

Applicant argues on pages 36 and 37 of the 8/14/03 response that, "the patent neither teaches nor suggests at least the feature of calculating, or arrangement calculation means for calculating, an arrangement the representations are spaced according to similarity values".

In response to Applicant's argument, Examiner disagrees. Fig. 22, Czerwinski illustrates all the objects are dragged in respect to the similarity distance of the selected moving object.

Examiner further points to another prior art, Ackermann system which also teaches the claimed matter that Applicants believe is novel, see fig. 3, Ackermann.

Art Unit: 2171

With respect to all the pending claims 49-62 and 68-88, Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's assertion based on the discussion cited above, as such, Examiner maintains the same rejections.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to display systems based on similarity and proximity:

- U.S. Patent No. 6,211,876 of Ackermann et al.
- U.S. Patent No. 6,405,195 of Ahlberg.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/523,313 Page 7

Art Unit: 2171

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc R Filipczyk whose telephone number is 703-305-7156. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

MF October 22, 2003

> SAFET METJAHIC SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100